## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

## SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2012

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4239) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a multiyear law reauthorizing such programs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4239

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''.

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2012 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (title I of Public Law 112–30) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; table of contents.

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

Sec. 101. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

Sec. 201. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 202. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 203. Additional programs.

TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 301. Allocation of funds for planning programs.

Sec. 302. Special rule for urbanized area formula grants.

Sec. 303. Allocating amounts for capital investment grants.

Sec. 304. Apportionment of formula grants for other than urbanized areas.

Sec. 305. Apportionment based on fixed guideway factors.

Sec. 306. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 307. Amendments to SAFETEA–LU.

TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

Sec. 401. Extension of trust fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 402. Extension of highway-related taxes.

### TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

**SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (Public Law 112–30; 125 Stat. 343) is amended—

(1) by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' each place it appears and inserting ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(2) by striking ''½'' each place it appears and inserting ''⅔'' ; and

(3) in subsection (a) by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 1, 2012''.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 111(c)(3)(B)(ii) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking ''$319,500,000'' and inserting ''$426,000,000''.

(c) EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER TITLE V OF SAFETEA–LU.—Section 111(e)(2) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 343) is amended by striking ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(d) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 112(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II (125 Stat. 346) is amended by striking ''$196,427,625 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''$261,903,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

### TITLE II—EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS

**SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.**

(a) CHAPTER 4 HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 2001(a)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$235,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$235,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $156,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(b) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 2001(a)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $54,122,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $72,162,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(c) OCCUPANT PROTECTION INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011, and $16,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(d) SAFETY BELT PERFORMANCE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''and $24,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $32,333,334 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(e) STATE TRAFFIC SAFETY INFORMATION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 2001(a)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $23,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(f) ALCOHOL-IMPAIRED DRIVING COUNTERMEASURES INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(6) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1519) is amended by striking ''$139,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$139,000,000 for each of fiscal years fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $92,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(g) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 2001(a)(7) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $2,058,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $2,744,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(h) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—Section 2001(a)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''for fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $19,333,334 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(i) MOTORCYCLIST SAFETY.—Section 2001(a)(9) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $4,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(j) CHILD SAFETY AND CHILD BOOSTER SEAT SAFETY INCENTIVE GRANTS.—Section 2001(a)(10) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2009'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''$7,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $4,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 2001(a)(11) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1520) is amended by striking ''and $12,664,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''and $16,885,334 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

**SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.**

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(8) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(8) $141,333,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(H) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(H) $162,762,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—Section 4101(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking ''2011 and $15,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $20,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.'';

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking ''2011 and $16,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $21,333,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.'';

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking ''2011 and $2,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $3,333,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.'';

(4) in paragraph (4) by striking ''2011 and $12,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $16,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''; and

(5) in paragraph (5) by striking ''2011 and $1,500,000 for the period beginning on October

1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012.'' and inserting ''2011 and $2,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2011 and $7,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $10,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''and up to $14,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and up to $19,333,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking ''2011 (and $500,000 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and $1,500,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012)'' and inserting ''2011 (and $666,667 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and $2,000,000 to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012)''.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1744) is amended by striking ''2011 and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(h) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 4144(d) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1748) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 1, 2012''.

(i) WORKING GROUP FOR DEVELOPMENT OF PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES TO ENHANCE FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS.—Section 4213(d) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 14710 note; 119 Stat. 1759) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 1, 2012''.

**SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.**

(a) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS RESEARCH PROJECTS.—Section 7131(c) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1910) is amended by striking ''2011 and $580,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $773,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(b) DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.—Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(2) in the first sentence of subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

## TITLE III—PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

**SEC. 301. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PLANNING PROGRAMS.**

Section 5305(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012''.

**SEC. 302. SPECIAL RULE FOR URBANIZED AREA FORMULA GRANTS.**

Section 5307(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''SPECIAL RULE FOR FISCAL YEARS 2005 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 1, 2012.—'';

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(3) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting ''MAXIMUM AMOUNTS IN FISCAL YEARS 2008 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 1, 2012.—''; and

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012''.

**SEC. 303. ALLOCATING AMOUNTS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.**

Section 5309(m) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting ''FISCAL YEARS 2006 THROUGH 2011 AND THE PERIOD BEGINNING ON OCTOBER 1, 2011, AND ENDING ON JUNE 1, 2012.—'';

(B) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(C) in subparagraph (A)(i) by striking ''2011 and $100,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $133,333,334 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(2) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''2011 and $7,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $10,000,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''2011 and $2,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $3,333,333 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(3) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking ''2011 and $5,000,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and $6,666,667 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(ii) in clause (i) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $1,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $1,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(iii) in clause (ii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $1,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $1,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(iv) in clause (iii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(v) in clause (iv) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(vi) in clause (v) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(vii) in clause (vi) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(viii) in clause (vii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $325,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $433,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(ix) in clause (viii) by striking ''for each fiscal year and $175,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each fiscal year and $233,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking clause (vii) and inserting the following:

''(vii) $9,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and during the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''and not less than $17,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and not less than $23,333,333 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''and $1,500,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''and $2,000,000 shall be available for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

**SEC. 304. APPORTIONMENT OF FORMULA GRANTS FOR OTHER THAN URBANIZED AREAS.**

Section 5311(c)(1)(G) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(G) $10,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

**SEC. 305. APPORTIONMENT BASED ON FIXED GUIDEWAY FACTORS.**

Section 5337(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JUNE 1, 2012.—The Secretary shall apportion amounts made available for fixed guideway modernization under section 5309 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012, in accordance with subsection (a), except that the Secretary shall apportion 67 percent of each dollar amount specified in subsection (a).''.

**SEC. 306. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.**

(a) FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS.—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

''(G) $5,573,710,028 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and

2010, $113,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $56,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$113,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $75,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $4,160,365,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $2,080,182,500 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$4,160,365,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $2,773,576,681 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking ''$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $51,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $25,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$51,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $34,333,334 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking ''$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $1,666,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $833,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$1,666,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $1,111,000,006 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(E) in subparagraph (E) by striking ''$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $984,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $492,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$984,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $656,000,003 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking ''$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $133,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $66,750,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$133,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $89,000,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $232,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $310,000,002 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking ''$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $164,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $82,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$164,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $109,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking ''$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $92,500,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $46,250,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$92,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $61,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking ''$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $26,900,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $13,450,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$26,900,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $17,933,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking ''in fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through ''March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $2,333,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(L) in subparagraph (L) by striking ''in fiscal year 2006'' and all that follows through ''March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2011 and $16,666,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,'';

(M) in subparagraph (M) by striking ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $465,000,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $232,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$465,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $310,000,002 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(N) in subparagraph (N) by striking ''$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 and 2010, $8,800,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $4,400,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''$8,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, and $5,866,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(b) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(c)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(7) $1,303,333,340 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

(c) RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''and 2010, $69,750,000 for fiscal year 2011, and $29,500,000 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''through 2011, and $29,333,333 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

''(A) RESEARCH.—Of amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each of the activities and projects described in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (1) an amount equal to 42 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such subparagraph.

''(B) UNIVERSITY CENTERS PROGRAM.—

''(i) OCTOBER 1, 2011, THROUGH JUNE 1, 2012.—Of the amounts allocated under subparagraph (A)(i) for the university centers program under section 5506 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012, the Secretary shall allocate for each program described in clauses (i) through (iii) and (v) through (viii) of paragraph (2)(A) an amount equal to 42 percent of the amount allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each such clause.

''(ii) FUNDING.—If the Secretary determines that a project or activity described in paragraph (2) received sufficient funds in fiscal year 2011, or a previous fiscal year, to carry out the purpose for which the project or activity was authorized, the Secretary may not allocate any amounts under clause (i) for the project or activity for fiscal year 2012 or any subsequent fiscal year.''.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(e)(7) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(7) $65,808,667 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012.''.

**SEC. 307. AMENDMENTS TO SAFETEA–LU.**

(a) CONTRACTED PARATRANSIT PILOT.—Section 3009(i)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1572) is amended by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(b) PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3011 of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5309 note; 119 Stat. 1588) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(5) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012''; and

(2) in the second sentence of subsection (d) by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(c) ELDERLY INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES PILOT PROGRAM.—Section 3012(b)(8) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5310 note; 119 Stat. 1593) is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 1, 2012''.

(d) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 3040(8) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1639) is amended to read as follows:

''(8) $6,972,185,368 for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012, of which not more than $5,573,710,028 shall be from the Mass Transit Account.''.

(e) PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR NEW FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL PROJECTS.—Section 3043 of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1640) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''; and

(2) in subsection (c), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on March 31, 2012,'' and inserting ''2011 and the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012,''.

(f) ALLOCATIONS FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—Section 3046(c)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 5338 note; 119 Stat. 1706) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) for the period beginning on October 1, 2011, and ending on June 1, 2012, in amounts equal to 42 percent of the amounts allocated for fiscal year 2009 under each of paragraphs (2), (3), (5), and (8) through (25) of subsection (a).''.

## TITLE IV—HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXTENSION

**SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.**

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting ''June 2, 2012''; and

(2) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II'' in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2011, Part II'' each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012''; and

(2) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' in subsection (d)(2) and inserting ''June 2, 2012''.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of such Code is amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''June 2, 2012''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2012.

**SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY-RELATED TAXES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Each of the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''March 31, 2012'' and inserting ''June 1, 2012'':

(A) Section 4041(a)(1)(C)(iii)(I).

(B) Section 4041(m)(1)(B).

(C) Section 4081(d)(1).

(2) Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''June 2, 2012'':

(A) Section 4041(m)(1)(A).

(B) Section 4051(c).

(C) Section 4071(d).

(D) Section 4081(d)(3).

(b) EXTENSION OF TAX, ETC., ON USE OF CERTAIN HEAVY VEHICLES.—Each of the following provisions of such Code is amended by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2013'':

(1) Section 4481(f).

(2) Subsections (c)(4) and (d) of section 4482.

(c) FLOOR STOCKS REFUNDS.—Section 6412(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 2, 2012'';

(2) by striking ''September 30, 2012'' each place it appears and inserting ''December 31, 2012''; and

(3) by striking ''July 1, 2012'' and inserting ''October 1, 2012''.

(d) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXEMPTIONS.—Sections 4221(a) and 4483(i) of such Code are each amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''June 2, 2012''.

(e) EXTENSION OF TRANSFERS OF CERTAIN TAXES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9503 of such Code is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' each place it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting ''June 2, 2012'';

(ii) by striking ''APRIL 1, 2012'' in the heading of paragraph (2) and inserting ''JUNE 2, 2012'';

(iii) by striking ''March 31, 2012'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''June 1, 2012''; and

(iv) by striking ''January 1, 2013'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''April 1, 2013''; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2), by striking ''January 1, 2013'' and inserting ''April 1, 2013''.

(2) MOTORBOAT AND SMALL-ENGINE FUEL TAX TRANSFERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (3)(A)(i) and (4)(A) of section 9503(c) of such Code are each amended by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''June 2, 2012''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—Section 201(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–11(b)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''April 1, 2013'' each place it appears and inserting ''June 2, 2013''; and

(ii) by striking ''April 1, 2012'' and inserting ''June 2, 2012''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on April 1, 2012.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 4239, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues and Mr. Speaker, this is a 60-day extension that has been agreed to by our leadership and negotiated with the other side of the aisle. I believe it will ensure the surface transportation programs at the Department of Transportation will continue to function, and that we can continue programs across the country, ensuring our men and women stay in jobs at such a difficult time with our economy, again, needing some reliability in transportation programs from this Federal level.

So with that, I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 4239, as amended, and I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
*Washington, DC, March 26, 2012.*

Hon. JOHN MICA,
*Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN MICA: I am writing concerning H.R. 4239, the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012,'' which is scheduled for floor consideration this week.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over the Internal Revenue Code. Title IV of this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by extending the current Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority and the associated Federal excise taxes to June 1, 2012. However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 4239, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration,

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP.
*Chairman.*

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
*Washington, DC, March 26, 2012.*

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4239, the ''Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2012.'' The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure recognizes the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest in H.R. 4239, and I appreciate your effort to facilitate consideration of this bill.

I also concur with you that forgoing action on this bill does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future, and I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will include our letters on H.R. 4239 in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. Again, I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
*Chairman.*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4239. This legislation is yet another example of the Republican leadership's ''my way or the highway'' approach to legislating. There was no consultation with anyone on this side of the aisle prior to this particular measure being introduced and scheduled for consideration. The extension is unduly long, and it ignores the fact that we do have a solution in hand in the form of a bipartisan Senate surface transportation bill which passed the other body the week before last.

With more than 2.7 million construction and manufacturing workers out of work, enough with the political games. With tens of millions more seeking a better life, it is far past the time to stop the brinksmanship.

As we approach the start of construction season, we need to come together to pass a highway bill that will improve our infrastructure and, most importantly, create jobs. Instead, Republicans in the House continue their ''my way or the highway'' approach that is now leading to a kick-the-can-down-the-road extension.

The other body has shown us the way. They passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill called MAP–21 with a vote of 74–22, with Senators BOXER and INHOFE leading the way across the ideological spectrum. The simple solution would be to take up that bill and pass it now. The President is prepared to sign it into law.

Yet, instead, we have before us another extension premised on the perverse notion that the Republican leadership will, over the next 60 days, garner enough votes on their side of the aisle to pass H.R. 7, the 5-year bill reported by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. That committee reported H.R. 7 on February 13. The Rules Committee approved a rule governing its consideration on the floor on February 15. That was almost 6 weeks ago. During that time, the Republican leadership has failed to find the votes among its Members to pass that bill. They do not have 218 votes, and they know it.

So the question is: What difference do they hope to achieve over the next 8 weeks that they were unable to achieve over the past 6 weeks? Not much, in my view, because the right wing of their party is holding H.R. 7 hostage to their ideological jihad that the Federal Government has no business in supporting a national transportation system.

On February 22, 1955, President Dwight Eisenhower stated:

Our unity as a Nation is sustained by free communication of thought and by easy

transportation of people and goods. The ceaseless flow of information throughout the Republic is matched by individual and commercial movement over a vast system of interconnected highways, crisscrossing the country and joining at our national borders with friendly neighbors to the north and south.

□ 1440

Promoted by a Republican President and passed by a Democratic-controlled Congress, America sought greatness as it embarked on the construction of the Interstate Highway System of 1956; and America achieved it, creating a transportation system that was once the envy of the world.

Yet H.R. 7 represents a full-scale retreat from that dynamic vision set forth 56 years ago. It mortgages America's future at subprime rates. It bankrupts the highway trust fund and endangers the future long-term integrity of transportation programs. It destroys American jobs at a time when legions of Americans are desperately seeking work and are trying to make ends meet. It is the wrong direction for America.

This day should be a day of glory. It should be a day when this body displays the courage and conviction necessary to address the pressing transportation needs of this Nation. Instead, it is a day of shame. It is a day when we are about to turn back the clock nearly half a century on America's greatness and on the incredible work we have done to grow our Nation, to build a thriving economy, and to lead the global market.

Unlike the House bill, which slashes funding and destroys 550,000 jobs, the other body's bill continues current funding levels, sustaining approximately 1.9 million jobs. Under the Senate bill, the States will receive $3.8 billion more in highway construction funding than the House bill over the course of 2 years.

The Senate bill eliminates many of the gaping loopholes in current law ''Buy America'' requirements—loopholes that are being exploited by foreign competitors, like China, who are stealing American jobs. MAP–21—that's the Senate bill—includes critical elements of my Buy America bill and the Invest in American Jobs Act, and it eliminates these loopholes in order to give American workers a fair shot. The Senate bill also does not contain poison pills like the House bill does, such as provisions to strip OSHA protections for hazmat workers and efforts to finance highway construction on the backs of middle class workers.

The Senate bill is not the bill I would have written, but it is a fair bipartisan compromise—a word some in this body don't like to hear, especially on the other side, but it is a word that is necessary for legislating. The bill will provide the certainty that States need to invest and proceed with their plans long on the books.

So, again, I call upon the Republican leadership to schedule that bill for consideration by this body now. Yet in the spirit of compromise—again, a word that's necessary in this body—I would remind the Republicans that it is a word in the dictionary, that it is a word that Americans use daily, and that I might consider supporting such a shorter extension than what is being proposed today, not this lavish 60-day, 8-week extension, but rather one that keeps our noses to the grindstone and that instills the sense of urgency that this matter deserves.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, let's deal with just a few facts.

First of all, the fact is that this would be the ninth extension. The fact is that the Democrats, who are on the other side of the aisle, when they controlled the entire House of Representatives and the United States Senate—the other body—in a huge majority and the White House, they did six extensions. That's the first fact.

The second fact is that the folks from the other side of the aisle, when they controlled it, they weren't even able to get a bill out from subcommittee to full committee. We passed it in committee, and we've gotten it this far to the floor with huge majorities. They did not pass it.

Let's just deal with the facts. The facts are, on June 17, 2009, after my cooperating with the previous chair on the other side of the aisle to go forward with a long-term bill, it was President Obama who sent then-Secretary Ray LaHood to tell us that they were going to kill a 6-year bill that we had agreed on to move forward, which they couldn't even get out of committee, to an 18-month extension.

These are the facts. The fact is that they had 6,300 earmarks in the last bill, and they were open to earmarks in the bill that they were about to propose. This bill is being brought forward without tax increases. It is responsibly funded with dramatic reforms and, again, devolves to the States and local governments, which actually build these projects, the streamlining and other financial opportunities that they can take advantage of.

As for the part about bankrupting the trust fund, let's deal again with facts. The facts are that the bill that is proposed by the other body is a 2-year bill, and the trust fund money expires in 18 months. That's not responsible. The bill we brought out has a pay-for.

With regard to the comments that we're slashing, we are continuing at current levels. It's $52 billion for 5 years. Do the math. It's 260. The Senate bill is $109 billion. It's 54.9. We are increasing spending at a time when we shouldn't be increasing spending, but we're maintaining the current level. They count no increase as a cut. That's the kind of math that's going on here.

So I came to the floor because there was a bipartisan agreement between the leadership of the House and the Senate to move forward because we have to get people to work. This is my third extension. I have had the honor and privilege of chairing the committee for—what?—14 months now. I have cooperated with the other side, including holding extensive hearings in the district of the first gentleman who spoke, Mr. RAHALL—in Beckley, West Virginia—all the way to the west coast. I've held dozens of hearings out in the field and here in Washington to try to develop legislation that could get the job done and so that we could do more with even the same amount of money and put people to work at this time in our country's history. So those are the facts.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the chair of the Highway Subcommittee.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

H.R. 4239 extends the surface transportation programs through May 31, 2012, at funding levels consistent with the fiscal year 2012 transportation appropriations bill passed last November. This extension is clean and does not add any policy provisions. Without this extension, Mr. Speaker, these programs are set to expire this Saturday. This legislation will allow the highway and transit programs to continue to operate as the spring construction season kicks off.

During this 2-month extension, we fully expect the House to pass H.R. 7, the American Energy and Infrastructure Jobs Act of 2012, and conference this bill with the Senate's 18-month reauthorization bill. H.R. 7, as Chairman MICA just noted, is a 5-year reauthorization bill that provides the long-term funding at current levels. It provides the predictability that States and localities need and have requested in order to plan major transportation projects and critical improvements to their transportation systems. Additionally, H.R. 7 eliminates, or would eliminate, wasteful Federal programs and put important decisionmaking power back in the hands of the States. There is no reason to have a bureaucrat in Washington dictating which projects should be funded in my home State of Tennessee or in other States.

Federal aid transportation projects around the Nation are sitting idle because of inefficient and unnecessary project review requirements. H.R. 7 goes the extra mile by streamlining the project review process and by eliminating scores of unnecessary Federal requirements. My constituents in the Second District of Tennessee and those throughout this Nation want a more efficient and smarter process for investing our Federal transportation dollars,

and H.R. 7 would accomplish this by doing more with less.

□ 1450

We need to speed up these highway projects. The last two studies by the Federal highway officials have estimated that it takes 13 years—one said 13 years; one said 15 years—from conception to completion. All these other developed nations around the world are doing these projects in a half or a third of the time that we are. We've got to speed things up to become more globally competitive.

When Congress sends H.R. 7 to the President, it will be considered the signature jobs bill that Americans have been waiting for Congress to pass. Just this week, Time magazine has a cover which describes our recovery as ''wimpy.'' Yesterday, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Chairman Bernanke, said that the job market continues to remain weak.

This bill, H.R. 7, if we can pass it, will create millions of jobs for hard-working Americans right here in the United States—not in China or India—and will leave a lasting impact with tangible improvements to our transportation infrastructure. By passing the long-term reauthorization bill that the business community and State and local officials across this country want, Americans will be able to see their tax dollars working to rebuild and strengthen our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems. In addition, people all over this country want us to stop rebuilding other countries and start doing what we need, rebuilding our own country and putting our own citizens first once again.

I urge my colleagues to pass this brief 2-month extension so that the House can continue its work and then pass H.R. 7, the long-term reauthorization reform bill that this country needs.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, the ranking member on our Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman.

Well, the Republicans have got the wheel hard over, pedal to the metal. They are spinning doughnuts. And they want another 90 days or 60 days—it was 90 days yesterday; 60 days today—to spin doughnuts until they run out of fuel on their side of the aisle.

Look, the Senate, which previous to this leadership was the most dysfunctional legislative body in the land, has passed a 2-year bill with reforms and streamlining with half of the Republican Senators, including some members of the Flat Earth Caucus, voting for it. It received 74 votes in the Senate. Nothing gets 74 votes in the Senate. But you're refusing to bring that bill up because—we might get something done around here. So how about another 60 days to spin our wheels?

Well, let's have a little bit of history here: February 8, 2011, Chairman MICA: ''We'll have a surface transportation bill by the August recess.'' That was, what, 2011. Oops. Well, then in August of 2011, Chairman MICA: ''I will agree to one additional highway program extension.'' Oops. He's asking for yet another and another and today yet another.

Well, then, spin forward quickly to November of 2011, Speaker BOEHNER: ''House will pass a highway bill this year.'' That was last year. Then we go forward to February 1, 2012. Here's the problem: they've got a bunch of people on their side who hate government so much that they're willing to destroy the national transportation program to kill it. We are not making the claim, Speaker BOEHNER, that spending taxpayer money on transportation projects creates jobs, are we, huh?

They hate government so much, they will say that investment by the government in building a national transportation system and maintaining it and rebuilding it with ''Made in America'' requirements does not create jobs. Why would he say that? Because they've got 80 people on their side of the aisle who do not believe we should have a national transportation plan or policy. They're willing to let our roads, bridges, and highways crumble.

This is the pre-Dwight David Eisenhower—a Republican President—National Highway System program. This is the brand-spiffy-new Kansas Turnpike that ended in this farmer's field on the Oklahoma border. This went on for years because Oklahoma didn't deliver its section. They want to go back to those good old days. No Federal mandates. No Federal transportation system. Oh, okay. So the Port of Los Angeles and the people of southern California should pay for everything that relates to getting freight in and out of L.A. It doesn't affect the rest of the United States of America. Or the Port of Portland or the Port of Seattle or the ports on the east coast.

Our competitor nations get it. They're spending. They're investing. Even countries with austerity programs, like Britain, they're putting people back to work. Despite what the Speaker had to say to the Flat Earth Caucus over there, it does create jobs and investments. We need to move forward.

Now they're saying, Oh, no problem, just another temporary delay while we get our act together on our side of the aisle. Well, again, we already heard the statement, no more, only one more temporary extension. That was about 9 months ago. And we're finding now that actually the delays are costing jobs, uncertainty costs jobs. States can't make commitments for major projects and investments if they don't know if there is going to be Federal money there in 90 days. Ninety days? Oh, 60 days. I forgot. In 60 days. They're going to plan a long-term project that can last 60 days? No, I don't think so.

So in North Carolina, the Secretary of Transportation says: The delays have cost 41,000 jobs. That seems a little high to me. But Nevada, 4,000 jobs. Maryland, 4,000 jobs. Michigan, 3,500 jobs. Adding it up across the country, even if we use the low numbers, we're talking tens of thousands of job opportunities lost because they can't get their act together.

Just let us vote on the Senate bill. That's all we're asking. I mean, I think there might be a few people on your side of the aisle who would agree with their Republican colleagues in the Senate and support it. And I can guarantee we would get almost every Democrat on this side of the aisle to vote for it.

You can't even get your own people to vote for your own bill. You are wrapped around the axle on your own caucus day after day. You have to pretend it won't create jobs. Well, that's not enough for them.

PAUL RYAN has now proposed in the budget, which we're going to vote on next, that we should decrease funding in transportation by 35 percent. But you're saying over there that you want to continue the current levels. Well, you'd better get it together because if you're going to support the Ryan budget, then you've just voted to cut transportation beginning October 1 by 35 percent. That's about 500,000 jobs. But what the heck.

You guys hate government so much, you hate America so much that you won't do what's necessary to put this country back together, to rebuild the infrastructure that was given to us by Democrats and Republicans alike for more than half a century, never in a partisan way. This is the first experiment, the first attempt to pass a totally partisan bill, and you're failing on your own side of the aisle.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this time to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chair of our Rail Subcommittee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the chairman.

Listening to the last speaker, I believe that the other side of the aisle has got a case of amnesia because I was here in 2007 and 2011 when they had the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, and the Presidency, and they did nothing. Well, that's not true. In fact, the last speaker, the gentleman from Oregon, he was the chair of the Highway Subcommittee; and we passed a bill by voice vote out of the subcommittee, a Democratic version. Voice vote. That means it came out of subcommittee in a bipartisan way.

Now, there was a lot in that bill I didn't like. But it was probably what the gentleman from Oregon, the last speaker, and the majority party wanted to do was to expand government control of the highway system, expand

the decision-making process to the bureaucrats in Washington instead of allowing the people in the States to make more of those decisions.

So it's startling to me to hear the criticism and insults hurled at our side of the aisle. I do take offense to the fact that he said we hate America. We love America. We love the American people and the wisdom of the American people and the wisdom of those in State government to make decisions, also.

I believe there is a national role in the transportation system in this country. It is a national policy. It's based on our founding. It's our history. We've always been part of this national system. So I want to pass a bill, a 5-year bill. I don't believe my colleagues have gone home and listened to their DOT directors and the people that build roads and sell equipment and the business people. They want a 5-year bill. They do not want a 2-year bill because they won't make decisions on expanding their businesses, buying equipment, hiring people on an 18-month bill.

□ 1500

And oh, by, the way, by the time we pass—if we pass—the Senate bill, it will be a 16-month bill. It's just another extension. It doesn't have reforms in it. Our bill does reform. It will allow that $260 billion to be spent faster. And anybody that's been in business and had to deal with the day in and day out knows that time is money. If it takes 14 to 15 years to build a highway versus 7 or 8, that's going to cost us a lot more money. That's common sense. That's why this 5-year bill is a commonsense bill and we need to pass it.

But I've come here on the floor today to debate not the 5-year bill because I believe it's the best way to go; I've come here to support the bipartisan agreement—I thought it was a bipartisan agreement; I guess we'll find out shortly—a bipartisan agreement for a 60-day clean extension that will give us the time to move forward and put a commonsense bill on the floor that will encourage growth in America. It will encourage people to hire and invest in their businesses when they're building roads and bridges in this country.

Failing to pass this extension is really not an option, so I hope that my friends will get behind this extension and pass it so that we can work to pass a bill that makes a lot of sense—and that is H.R. 7—and that will help to create jobs.

Again, I would remind my colleagues if they're watching this or colleagues in the Chamber, from 2007 to 2011 our Democratic colleagues that controlled both branches of government, both Houses of Congress, did not pass a highway bill. They passed a stimulus bill that didn't work. Only 8 percent of it went to highway and infrastructure projects. We as Republicans offered an alternative: half of the amount of money that the Democrats passed, and half of that money going to rebuilding our infrastructure.

If they truly cared about rebuilding the infrastructure of this country, they would have passed a highway bill from 2007 to 2011, but they failed to do it; and now they've come to the floor to criticize our side. And we've worked very, very hard. Chairman MICA has put together a bill that really does do significant reform. And I don't know why the other side resists reform when we can spend money quicker and we can get that money out there and rebuild the roads and bridges we need today.

Mr. RAHALL. May I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida, the distinguished ranking member of our Subcommittee on Railroads.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RAHALL, for your leadership on this transportation bill.

You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

When President Barack Obama came to the floor, he mentioned to the House that Republicans used to like to build some roads. Well, it is a sad state of affairs in this House of Representatives and a sad day as far as the committee is concerned because we used to have a process that was bipartisan. We worked together.

We can't pass a transportation bill. The only thing we passed was a new bridge for Minnesota. We had to transfer 30 acres of land in one individual congressional district. But the leadership of the Transportation Committee of this House of Representatives can't find floor time to debate a piece of legislation that would create and maintain millions of good-paying jobs for hardworking Americans. Republicans refuse to work with Democrats in crafting a transportation reauthorization bill that has caused us the opportunity to deliver much-needed relief to the States and to the traveling public.

Certainly, at a time when our Nation's unemployment rate remains at 9 percent, an adequately funded 6-year surface transportation reauthorization bill is critical. What our country needs is a surface transportation bill. But let me be clear: we don't need a 5-year bill with 2-year money.

Transportation and infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to our Nation. We know for every billion dollars we spend, it generates 44,000 permanent jobs. We need and deserve a long-term transportation bill, but the Tea Party members won't be happy until we are riding horses on dirt roads again.

We need to pass the Senate transportation reauthorization bill and add some sanity to this process and send a bill to the President that actually helps the traveling public and puts the American people back to work.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of time on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP), who has introduced the other body's bill in this House. It's labeled H.R. 14 and is twice as good as H.R. 7.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. I thank Mr. RAHALL for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 4239, the Republican 60-day highway bill extension.

As prime construction season begins, thousands of construction workers and their families will continue to struggle because our Republican colleagues would rather engage in hyperpartisan politics than put Americans back to work. Today's highway extension is yet another example of the failed leadership and absent policies of the Republican Party.

Unlike the successful bipartisan efforts of SAFETEA–LU, TEA–21, and ISTEA that put millions of Americans to work and made our highways and transit systems the envy of the world, today's Republican extension merely allows the Nation to limp forward, impeding our ability to rejuvenate our economy.

Let me be clear. This extension does nothing to create jobs or provide certainty to States. It does nothing to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure, and it does nothing to improve safety on our roadways and bridges.

It's been 6 weeks since the Rules Committee approved the rule for H.R. 7, the Republican highway reauthorization that was drafted in the dark of night and was passed out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee without a single person other than Chairman MICA having read the bill. When our Republican colleagues finally did read the bill, they, too, were struck by the overwhelmingly negative consequences for many of their States. The bill has been in limbo ever since.

If the priority of the Republican caucus was to create jobs, they would immediately take up and pass H.R. 14, the bipartisan Senate highway bill that will save 1.8 million jobs and create up to another million jobs, supporting over 113,000 jobs in my State of New York alone.

If the priority of the Republican caucus was to reduce the deficit, they would take up and pass H.R. 14, the only proposal in town that is fully paid for.

If the priority of the Republican caucus was to provide certainty to the markets and the States, then we would take up H.R. 14, the 2-year Senate bill, and not the 60-day extension the House Republicans now propose.

H.R. 14 not only passed by an overwhelming bipartisan majority in the

Senate—74–22—the bill enjoys 114 cosponsors in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. As House Republicans continue to isolate themselves from the mainstream, Americans continue to wait for much-needed infrastructure jobs and the thousands of businesses they support.

I urge my colleagues to reject this shortsighted extension of our Nation's transportation programs and pass H.R. 14, the bipartisan Senate bill.

Mr. MICA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield the customary 1 minute to our distinguished Democratic leader, the gentlelady from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I couldn't resist the opportunity to come to the floor to speak on the situation that we have before us.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his ongoing leadership in terms of bipartisanship and constructive legislation to rebuild America, which is so important to us. It has been the tradition—Mr. MICA will admit—that this has always been a bipartisan effort. That is the history. That is the tradition. That has served the country well.

□ 1510

For the first time, however, the Republicans have chosen to do a strictly Republican bill which our very respected Secretary of Transportation who served in this House as a Republican, served as a Member of Congress as well as served the minority leader, Mr. MICA, as a staff person, so he has a long history of knowledge of legislation in the Congress, said this was the worst transportation bill he had seen in his 35 years of public service—and, again, this is a field in which he is an expert.

He said the bill loses jobs, the bill Republicans want to put forth, H.R. 7, and it also diminishes safety. That is not a formula for a good transportation bill—less safety, fewer jobs, losing jobs. And so, we have an opportunity to support a bipartisan bill that has come from the Senate, three-quarters of the Senate in a bipartisan way passed it out. March 31 is the deadline when all of this will expire unless Congress acts, and Congress is not acting because the Republican majority does not have its act together. Their ''our way or the highway'' attitude means no highway bill that creates jobs and promotes public safety.

It's really so sad because in the tradition of our country, from the start, from the very start, Thomas Jefferson understood the need for building the infrastructure of America. He tasked his Secretary of the Treasury, Gallatin, to come up with a project that would expand into America, the Louisiana Purchase, and the Lewis and Clark expeditions. And out of that initiative came the Cumberland Road, the Erie Canal, and other things like that over time, and in that tradition, the Transcontinental Railroad and the rest that would come later.

Then in our century, a Republican President, President Eisenhower, at a time of bad economic times, bad economic times, he went forward and took the initiative for the interstate highway initiative, which was so important to our country. It was a security issue to unite America. It was a jobs initiative to build that interstate highway system. And it was about promoting commerce, connecting people, and improving the quality of life. It was a great initiative, and it, too, was a bipartisan initiative. In fact, in the Senate, our friend, Senator Gore, Vice President Gore, his father took the lead on that legislation, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, as we heard earlier from the gentlemen from Tennessee.

So this has all been a bipartisan initiative. It's about rebuilding America, which is part of our reigniting the American Dream to build ladders of opportunities so people who work hard, play by the rules, and take responsibility can have a ladder of success to climb and then put down for others to do. And part of that is A, Make It In America so that people can make it in America; and B, and I get to this point, build America, build America, build the infrastructure of America. And that means everything from the highways with mass transit, rapid transit, high-speed rail, and all kinds of technological infrastructure that we need with broadband and the rest.

It doesn't have any political or partisan cast to it at all. It never has—until now. And until now, for reasons that are very hard to explain to the American people, while we have a solution, we have a challenge. The authorization expires March 31. We have a bill that can be sent to the President in a matter of hours from this House of Representatives this day. And instead of smoothing the way, the road to jobs, we have the Republicans putting up, yet again, another obstacle because they have not been able to get unity in their caucus on a bill that promotes commerce, builds America, promotes safety, and creates jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs.

So what are we doing wasting the public's time with a 60-day extension? I support the leadership of our ranking member, Mr. RAHALL, when he talks about why we have to do something better, something more important, something more worthy of the concerns of the American people than a parliamentary maneuver that isn't going to produce anything. It doesn't even have anything attached to it that says, let's do this now so that we can do something better later. It has a bill that they cannot even pass on the House floor, their own H.R. 7. If they could pass that, they would. Their own caucus doesn't support what they're putting forth. So they expect the rest of us to cover for them.

Well, that is a real disservice to the American people. It is a real disservice to the hundreds of thousands of construction workers who are out of work. This job in its totality, and the jobs it would save and the jobs it would create, over 2 million jobs, and yet instead of doing that, we have a tactical maneuver for God knows what reason.

Everything we do is about time. It's about time, shortening the time in which people have to wait for jobs, shortening the times in which people get to and from their jobs. And it's about time that we put the American people back to work by passing the biggest jobs bill that Congress can ever pass, and that is a transportation bill. We have it right at our disposal. Mr. BISHOP introduced it as H.R. 14, we brought it up earlier today, and the Republicans resoundingly voted against the Senate bill. And I understand it was a procedural vote.

Now in a substantive vote, why don't you bring that bill to the floor? Why don't you bring that bill to the floor? And I ask the question again to my Republican colleagues: Why don't you bring the bill to the floor that three-quarters of the United States Senate in a bipartisan way passed out? We all want a longer bill. This is the bill they can pass. This is the bill we should pass so that the President can sign it into law. Anything else is just a conversation. Taking action, taking the votes, that is what the American people expect us to do. So we can talk all we want. What the American people want us to do is to act. And so I reject 60 days when we can do something much better for the American people.

Mr. MICA. I yield 2 minutes to Mr. SHUSTER, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I appreciate the opportunity to be able to ask my Democratic colleagues, following up on the distinguished leader's question but with a little twist to it, why didn't your side, when you had control of both Houses of Congress and the Presidency, why didn't you pass a bill, a highway bill? You had the votes. You could have done anything you wanted to.

In fact, the former distinguished Speaker that just spoke said that this is going to be the biggest jobs bill we pass. I thought your stimulus was supposed to be the biggest jobs bill we ever passed. It's amazing to me to come down here on the floor—and I have so much respect for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—but to hear this argument going round and round, and as I said earlier, there's amnesia on the other side of the aisle. You had control of Congress. The bill expired in 2009. You still had control of both Houses and the Presidency. You didn't pass a bill.

I also would like to make note, if you look back in the history of the highway bill, we've never been in the financial situation that we are today. We've never faced the kind of debt that we face today. And what this bill does is it lives within our means. But it does more than just that, living within our means, which we should do, and I would add, Thomas Jefferson would be appalled if he saw the kind of debt we've racked up today. He would be appalled by that.

So we're living within our means, and we're streamlining the process. We are saying we can do more with less if we change the process. The Senate bill doesn't have the kind of reforms. What the Senate bill does is it bankrupts the highway trust fund. It bankrupts the highway trust fund. And then we even have a bigger problem 2 years down the road, actually maybe 18 months, maybe 17 months, probably 16 months by the time we get it passed. The Senate bill requires States to incorporate livability and smart growth policies, as if the States aren't smart enough to do it themselves? As if the States and cities in this country can't figure out how they want to improve the livability of their cities? No. The Federal Government has to do it. The Federal Government has to insist that they do that.

Look, I think that Members of Congress ought to have the ability to direct where some of these funds go, but the Senate bill, what it allows are the bureaucrats.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICA. I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SHUSTER. The bureaucrats in Washington will decide how the money is spent, not even the folks back in the States. The Senate fails to streamline the project delivery process which we do. That will allow us to build roads faster, and time is money. Anybody that's been in business knows time is money. And that is extremely important to this. The Senate bill discourages private sector investment, and it increases the regulation. Like I said, this bill is a good bill, it's a solid bill, it's one that the people out there want to see, a 5-year bill, not a 17- or 16-month extension.

□ 1520

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are advised to refrain from referring to one another in the second person.

Mr. RAHALL. Can you give us the time remaining, please, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. OLVER.

Mr. OLVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, America's whole economy depends upon the efficient movement of people and goods. A modern, well-maintained transportation network is absolutely necessary for our economy to grow and the country to prosper, and its influence on the economy is staggering.

Our auto manufacturing industry and its enormous parts-supplier base, the national network of gas stations and its complex distribution system, and the oil industry itself all thrive because we have an efficient highway system that people need to use.

The physical construction of roads and railroads requires aggregate materials processed locally, steel trusses and rebar made by American companies and crews manned by American workers.

Our transit system supports the domestic manufacturing of buses, streetcars, and trains, while providing businesses with cost-effective access to the labor pool.

Furthermore, every good product produced or consumed in the U.S. must be transported via our network of roads, rails, and ports. As a result, the efficiency with which our system operates determines whether American goods can compete in the global marketplace.

Unfortunately, the 60-day extension Republicans offer on the floor today keeps our transportation system bogged down in a state of uncertainty. It slows down ongoing projects by only providing partial funding; it jeopardizes a major part of this construction season in northern States by hindering and delaying their ability to determine how many projects can be funded; and it shuts down the planning and design pipeline for future projects because they don't know what resources will be available.

Consequently, this being the ninth extension since 2009, State transportation programs are being forced to move forward only with projects that meet the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Speaker, if the Republican goal is to slow economic growth and keep unemployment high into the fall, this 60-day extension will accomplish that spectacularly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman 15 more seconds.

Mr. OLVER. I can think of nothing that would be more effective at slowing economic growth and keeping unemployment high.

Mr. Speaker, there is a better option. Bring it to the floor and let us vote on the Senate's multiyear bipartisan bill that was passed by a vote of 74–22, with majority support from both parties.

Mr. MICA. I have no further speakers, and I would reserve my time to close.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, to respond to the other side of the aisle about which party was in control when nothing was done or vice versa, whatever, as that side of the aisle knows, it takes so much to get the other body to agree on anything these days, to get the 60 votes necessary. It doesn't matter which party controls the other body; to get them to agree on something is difficult.

So I conclude by saying vote against these delays and pass the Senate bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Unfortunately, this has turned into, I guess, sort of a political ''gotcha'' game. If this was a sporting event right now, the umpire would probably come out, throw down the flag, and say a foul has been committed.

It's kind of sad that bipartisanship has become a one-way street. No one has worked harder than I have to try to accommodate the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, one of the former speakers said we had refused to work with the Democrats. That's not true. We took 60 percent of their recommendations. And one reason we took longer than I had hoped was to make certain that everybody had a fair and open opportunity. The process was completely open by going to the ranking member's district for the first hearing and all the way to the west coast.

In the amendment process, I told Members that everyone would be heard and everyone would have an opportunity to offer an amendment. Yes, we sat for 18 hours. We took over 100 amendments from the other side of the aisle, and each of them was considered with the respect and dignity that every Member of this body should have before everybody.

This is not true. Again, I just don't think it's fair.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) came to the floor and said that I was the only one that had a copy of the bill. In fact, the irony of it is that Mr. BISHOP and his staff, everyone—in fact, all the Members were given a copy beforehand, which is twice the period of time in the past; and copies of the bill were distributed from his office, which he also admitted to in committee long before the bill came to the committee.

The Secretary said this is the worst bill he has seen, and it is for bureaucrats and for people in those tall buildings in Washington, because we're consolidating programs. We went from six core programs to 130. We have offices that we don't need, duplicate programs. Someone is trying to actually do reform.

Yes, we do substantial reform. They throw money at problems. We, at least, keep it level and we responsibly pay for it. But even when they threw money at things, like the stimulus that Mr. SHUSTER brought forward, 35 percent of the money and 2½ years later, that money was still sitting in the Federal Treasury because shovel-ready became a national joke; and it is a national joke

because of the red tape, the bureaucracy, all by those people who may lose their jobs in those glass buildings right here in our Nation's Capital.

Again, I don't think it's fair. I'm disappointed. We tried to do a 90-day bill. The House and the Senate are going to be out for 2 weeks for Easter. Then they come back, and one body is out and the other body is out and nobody is here. They weren't happy with 90 days, and we tried to accommodate the 60 days.

This is a political game of ''gotcha,'' and it's unfortunate because there are many Americans who are counting on us for jobs and many people who have lost their home, particularly in the construction industry. They don't want rhetoric. They want action from this Congress. If we just had a cooperative effort on this, and true bipartisanship, we could get so much done for the American people.

I'm saddened in a way, but I tell you I've done everything I can to move this forward. For some of those people I've talked to that don't have a job, that have lost their homes and their life savings, we need to put a few of them to work. And we can if people would stop the nonsense and move forward in a responsible fashion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4239, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 1530

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 2012

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation and to insert extraneous materials on H.R. 3309.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 595 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3309.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1533

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3309) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, with Mr. KINZINGER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Assembly, the communications and technology sector is one of the most competitive, innovative, and open sectors of our economy. From fiber optics to 4G wireless service, from the smartphone to the tablet, to the connected TV, this sector has been creating new services and new devices and high quality jobs that come with high-tech innovation and investment.

Now, despite a lackluster economy, wire line, wireless, and cable providers invested $66 billion in broadband infrastructure in 2010. The U.S. is now leading in the cutting-edge wireless technologies. If we want this to continue, though, we need to avoid needless bureaucratic red tape and fix broken processes at the FCC.

Communications and technology companies and the public deserve a more transparent and responsive government agency, and that's exactly what the legislation before us now would accomplish, bringing transparency, bringing accountability to the Federal Communications Commission.

The bill is the fruit of the Energy and Commerce's own open and transparent process. Last May we invited the commissioners of the FCC to testify about improving their processes, and we heard from them about the process problems that have occurred at the agency when it's been headed by chairs from both parties. This is not about this commission. It may be about a prior commission, but it's about a systemic problem.

In June, staff released a discussion draft, and we held a legislative hearing with a diverse panel of experts representing industry, think-tanks, consumer groups, academia, and the States. We listened to what they had to say about the various ideas that were on the table, and we began to work to modify those ideas into something that was workable.

In response to the views presented at the hearings, as well as additional input from stakeholders and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we refined the draft legislation.

Then, in November, the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology held an open markup of the bill at the subcommittee level. The text is there. Everybody had a chance to see it, everybody had a chance to work on it and amend it.

Earlier this month, the committee marked up the bill, the full committee did, with several bipartisan amendments that continued to improve the FCC processes. So, in large part, the FCC Process Reform Act asked the FCC to go through a process similar to what we just went through in the committee, on the Energy and Commerce Committee, to actually craft this reform legislation. And then we asked the FCC to implement the kinds of reforms that we implemented in this very House to avoid abuses that had taken place in the past.

Now, the FCC regularly issues final decisions without giving the public an opportunity to even review the text that they're considering. I want you to think about that for a moment. They actually issue final decisions without giving the public an opportunity to review the text.

We don't operate that way in the House, at least not anymore. The transition team that Speaker BOEHNER asked me to chair after the last election adopted a requirement that people have time to read the bill. A 3-day layover provision's in place in this House now so that the public has a chance to read the bills, we have a chance to read the bills, the press corps in the gallery behind us has a chance to read the bills.

What's wrong with asking a Federal agency that writes regulations that affect one of the most dynamic industry in our Nation—what's wrong with asking them to make their text available? We do that in this legislation.

Let me tell you part of the problem here. Last October, the agency introduced more than 100 new documents into the record of its universal service proceeding in the last few days of public comment. Giving the public as few as 2 days to comment on thousands of pages of new data isn't right. These are some of the drafts of documents right here behind me in these binders. Can you imagine, in 2 days, you're supposed to evaluate everything there?

As the president and CEO of the Wireless Association said, there are other elements of H.R. 3309, such as the provision aimed at preventing data dumps—this we would call a data dump—right before an item goes on sunshine, that would represent significant improvement in the regulatory process. Sensible regulatory policies can contribute to the wireless industry's ability to continue serving as a catalyst for innovation, economic growth, and job creation.

So we're trying to get the commission not to do data dumps, to be more transparent. The bill would require the FCC to provide the public a minimum amount of time to review filings and